

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/525,206	03/14/2000	Marcus Peinado	MS1-394US	7714
22801 75	90 12/16/2003	EXAMINER		INER
LEE & HAYES PLLC			BACKER, FIRMIN	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
or ordinate, we	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		3621	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	A cant(s)				
	09/525,206	PEINADO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Firmin Backer	3621				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears n the cover sheet with the c rresp ndence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 C</u>						
<u>'</u>	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under a Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-66</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-66</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	,					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept	ted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exa	miner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
_a)	visional application has been rec	eived.				
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti Attachment(s)	c priority under 35 U.S.C. 99 120	anu/of 121.				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Response to Amendment

This is in response to an amendment file on October 8th, 2003 for letter for patent filed on March 14th, 2000. In the amendment, no claim has been amended, no claim has been canceled, and no claim has been added. Claims 1-66 remain pending in the letter.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead et al. (U.S. Patent 6,230,318) in view of Folmsbee (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,166).
- 4. As per claim 1, Halstead et al teach a method of providing an initial good to a computer wherein the initial digital good include a plurality of selectively arranged parts in an initial configuration and the initial digital good is configured as to not properly function with the

Application/Control Number: 09/525,206

Árt Unit: 3621

computer with at least one computer such that the plurality of selectively arrange parts in the modified digital good have been rearrange to have a substantially unique operative configuration tat properly functions with the computer and is different that the initial configuration and causing the at least one computer to run the modified digital good (see column 2 lines 33-47, 3 lines 1-10, 12 lines 36-53). Kurachi et al receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital (2lines 23-67). However, Folmsbee teaches receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time the invention was made to modify Halstead et al's inventive concept to include Folmsbee's receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital because this would have prevented user with complete access to the executable software and its copy protection system so that the user cannot figure out how the system works and use this information to defeat the software's copy protection system, certainly to disable the software's copy protection scheme.

5. As per claims 2-66, they disclose the same inventive concept as claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Application/Control Number: 09/525,206

Árt Unit: 3621

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firmin Backer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Firmin Backer Examiner Page 4

Art Unit 3621

December 7, 2003